

OPINION 1328

BELEMNITES MUCRONATUS SCHLOTHEIM, 1813 (COLEOIDEA):
CONSERVED AND NEOTYPE DESIGNATED

RULING.—(1) Under the plenary powers:

- (a) the specific name *mucronatus* Link, 1807, as published in the binomen *Belemnites mucronatus*, and all other uses prior to its use by Schlotheim, 1813, are hereby suppressed for the purposes of both the Principle of Priority and the Principle of Homonymy;
- (b) all designations of type specimen hitherto made for the nominal species *Belemnites mucronatus* Schlotheim, 1813, are hereby set aside and specimen number kca 5/2 in the collections of the Niedersächsisches Landesamt für Bodenforschung, Hanover, BRD, is designated as neotype of that species.

(2) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Generic Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *Belelnitella* d'Orbigny, 1840 (gender: feminine), type species, by subsequent designation by Herrmannsen, 1846, *Belemnites mucronatus* Schlotheim, 1813 (Name Number 2269);
- (b) *Belemnella* Nowak, 1913 (gender: feminine), type species by subsequent designation by von Bülow-Trummer, 1920, *Belemnites lanceolatus* Schlotheim, 1813 (Name Number 2270);

(3) The following names are hereby placed on the Official List of Specific Names in Zoology with the Name Numbers specified:

- (a) *mucronatus* Schlotheim, 1813, as published in the binomen *Belemnites mucronatus*, and as defined by the neotype designated under the plenary powers in (1)(b) above (specific name of the type species of *Belelnitella* d'Orbigny, 1840) (Name Number 2979)
- (b) *lanceolatus* Schlotheim, 1813, as published in the binomen *Belemnites lanceolatus* (specific name of the type species of *Belemnella* Nowak, 1913) (Name Number 2980).

(4) The family name BELEMNITELLIDAE Pavlow, 1914 (type genus *Belelnitella* d'Orbigny, 1840) is hereby placed on the Official List of Family-Group Names in Zoology with the Name Number 572.

HISTORY OF THE CASE Z.N.(S.)1160

An application for the use of plenary powers to attribute *Belemnites mucronatus* to Schlotheim, 1813 and to designate a neotype in conformity

with current usage was first received from Dr J. A. Jeletzky, then of the *Geological Survey of Canada, Ottawa*, on 8 September 1956. After a long period of correspondence a revised draft was sent to the printers on 17 December 1963 and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 21, pp. 268–302. Public notice of the possible use of plenary powers was given in the same part of the *Bulletin* and to the statutory serials, six general and two palaeontological serials. The application was supported in general terms by Dr C. W. Wright (*London*), Mr R. V. Melville (*British Embassy, Paris*), Professor D. T. Donovan (*Hull University, U.K.*) and Dr C. L. Forbes (*University of Cambridge, U.K.*). Alternative proposals concerning the neotype selection were received from Mr N. B. Peake (*Norwich, U.K.*) & Dr J. M. Hancock (*Kings College, London*) and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 22, pp. 343–345. Support for these proposals was received from Mr R. V. Melville and Mr C. J. Wood (*Geological Survey and Museum, London, U.K.*) and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 23, pp. 70–71. A further comment concerning the proposed neotype was received from Dr D. P. Naidin (*Lomonosov University of Moscow, USSR*) and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 28, pp. 131–138. A comment by Dr W. K. Christensen (*Mineralogisk-Geologisk Museum, Copenhagen, Denmark*), Prof. Dr G. Ernst (*Institut für Paläontologie der Freien Universität Berlin*), Prof. Dr F. Schmid (*Niedersächsisches Landesamt für Bodenforschung, Hannover, BRD*), Dr M. G. Schulz (*Geol.-Paläont. Institut der Universität Kiel, BRD*) and Mr C. J. Wood (*Institute of Geological Sciences, London, U.K.*) offering alternative proposals to those of Jeletzky and Naidin for the designation of a neotype was published in *Geol. Jahrb.*, vol. A9, pp. 41–45. These were eventually drafted into a revised and updated application by the Secretary and published in *Bull. zool. Nom.*, vol. 39, pp. 141–145. Reasons for the rejection of the two previous proposals by Jeletzky and Naidin are given in the abstract preceding the application on p. 141. No other comments were received.

DECISION OF THE COMMISSION

On 13 September 1984 the members of the Commission were invited to vote under the Three-month rule on Voing Paper (1984)59 for or against the proposals set out in *Bull. zool. Nom.* vol. 39, pp. 144–145. At the close of the voting period on 13 December 1984 the state of the voting was as follows:

Affirmative Votes — nineteen (19) received in the following order: Melville, Holthuis, Cocks, Brinck, Hahn, Mroczkowski, Willink, Trjapitzin, Uéno, Starobogatov, Sabrosky, Alvarado, Ride, Kraus, Corliss, Schuster, Bayer, Heppell (in part), Binder

Negative Votes — one (1) Dupuis.

Lehtinen was on leave of absence. No votes were returned by Bernardi, Cogger, Halvorsen and Savage.

The following comments were returned by members of the Commission with their voting papers:

Holthuis: 'A much more sensible solution would have been to make the neotype for *Belemnites mucronatus* Link, 1807, as;

- (1) then Link's name had not to be suppressed under the plenary powers;
- (2) the valid specific name for the species would have been 6 years older, and thus less likely to have senior synonyms or senior homonyms;
- (3) the specific name remains the same;
- (4) Link's species is so vaguely described that any neotype material fits it, and as no type material of it is known to exist, the neotype selection could have been done without recourse to the plenary powers.

Of *Belemnites mucronatus* Schlotheim, on the other hand, we know that it is (at least partly) based on a species different from the one for which the name is used at present and which is represented by the neotype.

'The procedure adopted now is unnecessarily complicated. However, as it produces the desired solution I vote for it.'

Heppell: 'I vote for the proposals in this case but believe there should be a small emendation to the wording of paragraph 8(1)b. That used is appropriate only for cases where an existing holotype or lectotype designation is set aside by the Commission in favour of a new lectotype designation from the original type series. In cases of neotype designation it is usually necessary to show that all original material (including in this case the specimen(s) figured by Breynius and Faujas) has been lost or destroyed, and that the neotype is consistent with the original type material (whereas in this case the applicants state that the Breynius figures illustrate a species not even congeneric with *Belemnitella mucronata* auct.) In this case, therefore, it is obviously necessary not only to set aside the earlier designations of neotype by Jeletzky and by Naidin, but also to set aside all original type material extant or illustrated. For that reason I believe paragraph 8(1)b of the application should have read; 'to set aside all original type material and all designation of type material hitherto made. . .' and that this should be indicated in the published Opinion.' [This has been done. RVM]

'As the nominal species *B. mucronata* is now to be defined by the neotype designated under the plenary powers it would seem immaterial whether the name is attributed to Link, 1807, or to Schlotheim, 1813, except to indicate the date of its priority. I would have thought in those circumstances that the earlier attribution would have been preferable, but if the applicants are content that no other name published between 1807 and 1813 is likely to complicate the issue I am happy to acquiesce in what seems to have become general usage.'

Dupuis: 'J'ai pris à la lettre l'argument selon lequel "stratigraphic nomenclature would be violently disturbed by the transfer of the term 'Mucronata zone' from a Campanian to a Maestrichtian zone". Pour

oeuvrer conformément à ce souci, il convenait, me semble-t-il, de se référer à un "topotype" provenant de la localité stratotypique de la zone à *mucronata*. Barrois, 1876 est cité comme l'auteur de cette "zone". La requête, telle qu'elle figure au *Bull.* 39: 141-145 ne permet cependant pas de juger s'il existe un rapport objectif entre le stratotype (if any) de Barrois et les stratotypes implicites d'Angleterre, de Russie ou d'Allemagne que l'on nous propose, avec autant de candidats néotypes pour *mucronata* que de nations. Il ne semble pas, au demeurant, que l'on ait recherché des matériaux de Barrois. Aussi longtemps qu'un candidat néotype ne proviendra pas de la localité stratotypique (vraisemblablement située dans le Bassin anglo-parisien) je resterai sourd à l'argument de "current usage", mis en avant pour la forme et aussitôt éclipsé par des considérations plus ou moins nationalistes.'

ORIGINAL REFERENCES

The following are the original references for the names placed on the Official Lists by the ruling given in the present Opinion:

- Belemnella* Nowak, 1913, *Bull. Acad. Sci. Cracovie*, Ser. B, 1913, pp. 393, 403-405
- Belemnitella* d'Orbigny, 1840, *Paléontologie française*, Terr. Crét., vol. 1 (Ceph), p. 59
- BELEMNITELLIDAE Pavlow, 1914, *Mém. Acad. imp. Sci. St. Petersbourg*, vol. 21(4), p. 7
- lanceolatus*, *Belemnites*, Schlotheim, 1813, *Leonhard's Tasch. Min.*, vol. 7, p. 111
- mucronatus*, *Belemnites*, Schlotheim, 1813, *Leonhard's Tasch. Min.*, vol. 7, p. 111.

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the votes cast on Voting Paper (84)59 were cast as set out above, that the proposals contained in that voting paper have been duly adopted under the plenary powers, and that the decision so taken, being the decision of the International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature, is truly recorded in the present Opinion No. 1328.

R. V. MELVILLE
 Secretary
 International Commission on Zoological Nomenclature
 London
 20 February 1985